

[Start](#)[Peaked Oil](#)[Climate Chaos](#)[JFK](#)[9/11](#)[World War IV](#)[Media](#)[Homeland Security](#)[fake elections](#)

Zbigniew Brzezinski

warns of false flag attack to trigger War on Iran

Zbigniew Brzezinski is the chief foreign policy advisor for the [Obama for President](#) campaign (Obama was a student of his at Columbia University).

Brzezinski crafted previous plans for the Peak Oil Wars when he helped design the Rapid Deployment Force in the late 1970s (now called Central Command, the military command that attacked Iraq).

on this page:

- [The Grand Chessboard \(his 1997 book outlining the Peak Oil Wars\)](#)
- [Brzezinski and the Soviet - Afghanistan War](#)
- [Senate Foreign Relations Committee - February 1, 2007 - warns of a possible "provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a 'defensive' U.S. military action against Iran"](#)

The Grand Chessboard (his 1997 book)

"Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, [except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat.](#)"

-- **"The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives,"** by [Zbigniew Brzezinski \(1997\)](#), Council on Foreign Relations, National Security Advisor to President Carter and adviser to Presidents Reagan and Bush the First

www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/zbig.html

A War in the Planning for Four Years
HOW STUPID DO THEY THINK WE ARE?

Zbigniew Brzezinski and the CFR [Council on Foreign Relations] Put War Plans In a 1997 Book - It Is "A Blueprint for World Dictatorship," Says a Former German Defense and NATO Official Who Warned of Global Domination in 1984, in an Exclusive Interview With FTW

by Michael C. Ruppert

[© Copyright 2001. All Rights Reserved, Michael C. Ruppert And From The Wilderness Publications, [Www.Copvicia.Com.](#)] May Be Copied Or Distributed For Non-Profit Purposes Only. Posting On Any ".Com" Web Site Is Prohibited Without Express Written Consent From The Author.]

Summary

"THE GRAND CHESSBOARD - American Primacy And It's Geostrategic Imperatives," Zbigniew Brzezinski, Basic Books, 1997.

These are the very first words in the book: "Ever since the continents started interacting politically, some five hundred years ago, Eurasia has been the center of world power."- p. xiii. Eurasia is all of the territory east of Germany and Poland, stretching all the way through Russia and China to the

Pacific Ocean. It includes the Middle East and most of the Indian subcontinent. The key to controlling Eurasia, says Brzezinski, is controlling the Central Asian Republics. And the key to controlling the Central Asian republics is Uzbekistan. Thus, it comes as no surprise that Uzbekistan was forcefully mentioned by President George W. Bush in his address to a joint session of Congress, just days after the attacks of September 11, as the very first place that the U.S. military would be deployed.

As FTW has documented in previous stories, major deployments of U.S. and British forces had taken place before the attacks. And the U.S. Army and the CIA had been active in Uzbekistan for several years. There is now evidence that what the world is witnessing is a cold and calculated war plan - at least four years in the making - and that, from reading Brzezinski's own words about Pearl Harbor, the World Trade Center attacks were just the trigger needed to set the final conquest in motion.

FTW, November 7, 2001, 1200 PST (Revised Jan. 21, 2002) - There's a quote often attributed to Allen Dulles after it was noted that the final 1964 report of the Warren Commission on the assassination of JFK contained dramatic inconsistencies. Those inconsistencies, in effect, disproved the Commission's own final conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone on November 22, 1963. Dulles, a career spy, Wall Street lawyer, the CIA director whom JFK had fired after the 1961 Bay of Pigs fiasco - and the Warren Commission member who took charge of the investigation and final report - is reported to have said, "The American people don't read."

Some Americans do read. So do Europeans and Asians and Africans and Latin Americans.

World events since the attacks of September 11, 2001 have not only been predicted, but also planned, orchestrated and - as their architects would like to believe - controlled. The current Central Asian war is not a response to terrorism, nor is it a reaction to Islamic fundamentalism. It is in fact, in the words of one of the most powerful men on the planet, the beginning of a final conflict before total world domination by the United States leads to the dissolution of all national governments. This, says Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) member and former Carter National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, will lead to nation states being incorporated into a new world order, controlled solely by economic interests as dictated by banks, corporations and ruling elites concerned with the maintenance (by manipulation and war) of their power. As a means of intimidation for the unenlightened reader who happens upon this frightening plan - the plan of the CFR - Brzezinski offers the alternative of a world in chaos unless the U.S. controls the planet by whatever means are necessary and likely to succeed.

http://mkane.gnn.tv/blogs/24618/Video_of_Chenev_on_Gulf_War_1_Surprise

Video of Cheney on Gulf War 1 - Surprise?!?

Fri, 17 Aug 2007

by Michael Kane

A man who operates with precision and mastery in the dialogue of public policy decision making is Zbigniew Brzezinski; former National Security Advisor to President Carter (a Democrat), co-founder of the Tri-lateral Commission and registered Republican. In his now infamous book titled *The Grand Chessboard*, published in 1997, Brzezinski laid out the geo-strategic importance of the Middle East and Central Asia as being the regions where the next major global conflict(s) would take place. In this book Brzezinski says the "imperial mobilization" necessary to commandeer the world's remaining hydrocarbon reserves would be hard to embark upon without a catastrophic and catalyzing event on par with Pearl Harbor.

A group of men who call themselves the "neo-cons" took up Brzezinski's chessboard and created The Project for a New American Century (PNAC). In 2000 these men took the Whitehouse. The neo-cons also recognized that a "catastrophic and catalyzing event, like a new Pearl Harbor," would benefit their dreams of imperial mobilization. Well, the new Pearl Harbor they all publicly prayed for came and went, and just as they had predicted, it helped to speed up the process of American imperial mobilization.

But now Brzezinski is singing a much different tune. When Israel embarked on its failed war in Southern Lebanon, Brzezinski publicly stated the following on numerous occasions:

These neocon prescriptions, of which Israel has its equivalents, are fatal for America and ultimately for Israel. They will totally turn the overwhelming majority of the Middle East's population against

the United States. The lessons of Iraq speak for themselves. Eventually, if neo-con policies continue to be pursued, the United States will be expelled from the region and that will be the beginning of the end for Israel as well.

Brzezinski publicly voiced this strong opinion on July 20, 2006 – about one week after Israel invaded Lebanon – at The New American Foundation American Strategy Program, where Daniel Yergin sits on the Board of Directors.

Brzezinski and the Soviet - Afghanistan war

www.globalresearch.ca/articles/BRZ110A.html

According to this 1998 interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, the CIA's intervention in Afghanistan preceded the 1979 Soviet invasion. This decision of the Carter Administration in 1979 to intervene and destabilise Afghanistan is the root cause of Afghanistan's destruction as a nation.
M.C.

emperors-clothes.com/interviews/brz.htm

A couple of thoughts about the Brzezinski interview below. First, it flatly contradicts the common justification for U.S. actions in Afghanistan during the 1980s: that the U.S. simply aided forces resisting Soviet imperialism. Brzezinski makes clear that the Soviets were baited into sending forces to Afghanistan; thus their actions were defensive. Moreover, the U.S. used the violent Wahhabi (Saudi Arabian) form of Islam to create a monster-movement which plagues the world today. or more on this, see 'Articles Documenting U.S. Creation of Taliban and bin Laden's Terrorist Network' at <http://emperors-clothes.com/docs/doc.htm>
A reader wrote: "Similarly just because Brzezinski (among others) likes to claim that he personally overthrew the Soviet Union doesn't mean that you or the rest of us have to take him seriously. Nobody in 1979 had any reason to think that the Afghan war would bring down the USSR. Nor have we any real reason to think that it did bring it down."

The point is well taken at least as regards Brzezinski's claim that his Afghan strategy destroyed the Soviet Union. But the issue here is a different one: what role did the U.S. government play in the creation of Islamist terrorism? In that regard, Brzezinski's assertion that the U.S. provoked Soviet actions and that Islamism was deliberately fostered is backed up by sources on all sides of the Afghan issue.

<http://members.aol.com/bblum6/brz.htm>

Interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski about how the US provoked the Soviet Union into invading Afghanistan and starting the whole mess

Le Nouvel Observateur (France), Jan 15-21, 1998, p. 76*

Question: The former director of the CIA, Robert Gates, stated in his memoirs [From the Shadows], that American intelligence services began to aid the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan six months before the Soviet intervention. In this period you were the national security adviser to President Carter. You therefore played a role in this affair. Is that correct?

Brzezinski: Yes. According to the official version of history, CIA aid to the Mujahadeen began during 1980, that is to say, after the Soviet army invaded Afghanistan, 24 Dec 1979. But the reality, closely guarded until now, is completely otherwise: Indeed, it was July 3, 1979 that President Carter signed the first directive for secret aid to the opponents of the pro-Soviet regime in Kabul. And that very day, I wrote a note to the president in which I explained to him that in my opinion this aid was going to induce a Soviet military intervention.

Question: Despite this risk, you were an advocate of this covert action. But perhaps you yourself desired this Soviet entry into war and looked to provoke it?

Brzezinski: It isn't quite that. We didn't push the Russians to intervene, but we knowingly increased the probability that they would.

Question: When the Soviets justified their intervention by asserting that they intended to fight against secret involvement of the United States in Afghanistan, people didn't believe them. However, there was a basis of truth. You don't regret anything today?

Brzezinski: Regret what? That secret operation was an excellent idea. It had the effect of drawing the Russians into the Afghan trap and you want me to regret it? The day that the Soviets officially

crossed the border, I wrote to President Carter, in substance: We now have the opportunity of giving to the USSR its Vietnam war. Indeed, for almost 10 years, Moscow had to carry on a war unsupportable by the government, a conflict that brought about the demoralization and finally the breakup of the Soviet empire.

Question: And neither do you regret having supported the Islamic fundamentalists, having given arms and advice to future terrorists?

Brzezinski: What is most important to the history of the world? The Taliban or the collapse of the Soviet empire? Some stirred-up Moslems or the liberation of Central Europe and the end of the cold war?*

Question: Some stirred-up Moslems? But it has been said and repeated: Islamic fundamentalism represents a world menace today.

Brzezinski: Nonsense! It is said that the West had a global policy in regard to Islam. That is stupid. There isn't a global Islam. Look at Islam in a rational manner and without demagoguery or emotion. It is the leading religion of the world with 1.5 billion followers. But what is there in common among Saudi Arabian fundamentalism, moderate Morocco, Pakistan militarism, Egyptian pro-Western or Central Asian secularism? Nothing more than what unites the Christian countries.*

There are at least two editions of this magazine; with the perhaps sole exception of the Library of Congress, the version sent to the United States is shorter than the French version, and the Brzezinski interview was not included in the shorter version.

** It should be noted that there is no demonstrable connection between the Afghanistan war and the breakup of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

This interview was translated from the French by William Blum, Author of "Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II" and "Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower". Portions of the books can be read at: <http://members.aol.com/superogue/homepage.htm> (with a link to Killing Hope)

Senate Foreign Relations Committee February 1, 2007
--

<http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2007/BrzezinskiTestimony070201.pdf>

SFRC Testimony -- Zbigniew Brzezinski
February 1, 2007

Mr. Chairman:

Your hearings come at a critical juncture in the U.S. war of choice in Iraq, and I commend you and Senator Lugar for scheduling them.

It is time for the White House to come to terms with two central realities:

1. The war in Iraq is a historic, strategic, and moral calamity. Undertaken under false assumptions, it is undermining America's global legitimacy. Its collateral civilian casualties as well as some abuses are tarnishing America's moral credentials. Driven by Manichean impulses and imperial hubris, it is intensifying regional instability.
2. Only a political strategy that is historically relevant rather than reminiscent of colonial tutelage can provide the needed framework for a tolerable resolution of both the war in Iraq and the intensifying regional tensions.

If the United States continues to be bogged down in a protracted bloody involvement in Iraq, the final destination on this downhill track is likely to be a head-on conflict with Iran and with much of the world of Islam at large. A plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran involves Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks; followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure; **then by**

some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a "defensive" U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

A mythical historical narrative to justify the case for such a protracted and potentially expanding war is already being articulated. Initially justified by false claims about WMD's in Iraq, the war is now being redefined as the "decisive ideological struggle" of our time, reminiscent of the earlier collisions with Nazism and Stalinism. In that context, Islamist extremism and al Qaeda are presented as the equivalents of the threat posed by Nazi Germany and then Soviet Russia, and 9/11 as the equivalent of the Pearl Harbor attack which precipitated America's involvement in World War II.

This simplistic and demagogic narrative overlooks the fact that Nazism was based on the military power of the industrially most advanced European state; and that Stalinism was able to mobilize not only the resources of the victorious and militarily powerful Soviet Union but also had worldwide appeal through its Marxist doctrine. In contrast, most Muslims are not embracing Islamic fundamentalism; al Qaeda is an isolated fundamentalist Islamist aberration; most Iraqis are engaged in strife because the American occupation of Iraq destroyed the Iraqi state; while Iran—though gaining in regional influence—is itself politically divided, economically and militarily weak. To argue that America is already at war in the region with a wider Islamic threat, of which Iran is the epicenter, is to promote a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Deplorably, the Administration's foreign policy in the Middle East region has lately relied almost entirely on such sloganeering. Vague and inflammatory talk about "a new strategic context" which is based on "clarity" and which prompts "the birth pangs of a new Middle East" is breeding intensifying anti-Americanism and is increasing the danger of a long-term collision between the United States and the Islamic world. Those in charge of U.S. diplomacy have also adopted a posture of moralistic self-ostracism toward Iran strongly reminiscent of John Foster Dulles's attitude of the early 1950's toward Chinese Communist leaders (resulting among other things in the well-known episode of the refused handshake). It took some two decades and a half before another Republican president was finally able to undo that legacy.

One should note here also that practically no country in the world shares the Manichean delusions that the Administration so passionately articulates. The result is growing political isolation of, and pervasive popular antagonism toward the U.S. global posture.

* * *

It is obvious by now that the American national interest calls for a significant change of direction. There is in fact a dominant consensus in favor of a change: American public opinion now holds that the war was a mistake; that it should not be escalated, that a regional political process should be explored; and that an Israeli-Palestinian accommodation is an essential element of the needed policy alteration and should be actively pursued. It is noteworthy that profound reservations regarding the Administration's policy have been voiced by a number of leading Republicans. One need only invoke here the expressed views of the much admired President Gerald Ford, former Secretary of State James Baker, former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft and several leading Republican senators, John Warner, Chuck Hagel, and Gordon Smith among others.

The urgent need today is for a strategy that seeks to create a political framework for a resolution of the problems posed both by the US occupation of Iraq and by the ensuing civil and sectarian conflict. Ending the occupation and shaping a regional security dialogue should be the mutually reinforcing goals of such a strategy, but both goals will take time and require a genuinely serious U.S. commitment.

The quest for a political solution for the growing chaos in Iraq should involve four steps:

1. The United States should reaffirm explicitly and unambiguously its determination to leave Iraq in a reasonably short period of time.

Ambiguity regarding the duration of the occupation in fact encourages unwillingness to compromise and intensifies the on-going civil strife. Moreover, such a public declaration is needed to allay fears in the Middle East of a new and enduring American imperial hegemony. Right or wrong, many view the establishment of such a hegemony as the primary reason for the American intervention in a

region only recently free of colonial domination. That perception should be discredited from the highest U.S. level. Perhaps the U.S. Congress could do so by a joint resolution.

2. The United States should announce that it is undertaking talks with the Iraqi leaders to jointly set with them a date by which U.S. military disengagement should be completed, and the resulting setting of such a date should be announced as a joint decision. In the meantime, the U.S. should avoid military escalation.

It is necessary to engage all Iraqi leaders—including those who do not reside within “the Green Zone”—in a serious discussion regarding the proposed and jointly defined date for U.S. military disengagement because the very dialogue itself will help identify the authentic Iraqi leaders with the self-confidence and capacity to stand on their own legs without U.S. military protection. Only Iraqi leaders who can exercise real power beyond “the Green Zone” can eventually reach a genuine Iraqi accommodation. The painful reality is that much of the current Iraqi regime, characterized by the Bush administration as “representative of the Iraqi people,” defines itself largely by its physical location: the 4 sq. miles-large U.S. fortress within Baghdad, protected by a wall in places 15 feet thick, manned by heavily armed U.S. military, popularly known as “the Green Zone.”

3. The United States should issue jointly with appropriate Iraqi leaders, or perhaps let the Iraqi leaders issue, an invitation to all neighbors of Iraq (and perhaps some other Muslim countries such as Egypt, Morocco, Algeria, and Pakistan) to engage in a dialogue regarding how best to enhance stability in Iraq in conjunction with U.S. military disengagement and to participate eventually in a conference regarding regional stability.

The United States and the Iraqi leadership need to engage Iraq’s neighbors in serious discussion regarding the region’s security problems, but such discussions cannot be undertaken while the U.S. is perceived as an occupier for an indefinite duration. Iran and Syria have no reason to help the United States consolidate a permanent regional hegemony. It is ironic, however, that both Iran and Syria have lately called for a regional dialogue, exploiting thereby the self-defeating character of the largely passive – and mainly sloganeering – U.S. diplomacy.

A serious regional dialogue, promoted directly or indirectly by the U.S., could be buttressed at some point by a wider circle of consultations involving other powers with a stake in the region’s stability, such as the EU, China, Japan, India, and Russia. Members of this Committee might consider exploring informally with the states mentioned their potential interest in such a wider dialogue.

4. Concurrently, the United States should activate a credible and energetic effort to finally reach an Israeli-Palestinian peace, making it clear in the process as to what the basic parameters of such a final accommodation ought to involve.

The United States needs to convince the region that the U.S. is committed both to Israel’s enduring security and to fairness for the Palestinians who have waited for more than forty years now for their own separate state. Only an external and activist intervention can promote the long-delayed settlement for the record shows that the Israelis and the Palestinians will never do so on their own. Without such a settlement, both nationalist and fundamentalist passions in the region will in the longer run doom any Arab regime which is perceived as supportive of U.S. regional hegemony.

After World War II, the United States prevailed in the defense of democracy in Europe because it successfully pursued a long-term political strategy of uniting its friends and dividing its enemies, of soberly deterring aggression without initiating hostilities, all the while also exploring the possibility of negotiated arrangements. Today, America’s global leadership is being tested in the Middle East. A similarly wise strategy of genuinely constructive political engagement is now urgently needed.

It is also time for the Congress to assert itself.

www.wsws.org/articles/2007/feb2007/brze-f02.shtml

A political bombshell from Zbigniew Brzezinski
Ex-national security adviser warns that Bush is seeking a pretext to attack Iran
By Barry Grey in Washington DC
2 February 2007

.... At another point Brzezinski remarked on the conspiratorial methods of the Bush administration

and all but described it as a cabal. "I am perplexed," he said, "by the fact that major strategic decisions seem to be made within a very narrow circle of individuals—just a few, probably a handful, perhaps not more than the fingers on my hand. And these are the individuals, all of whom but one, who made the original decision to go to war, and used the original justifications to go to war."

None of the senators in attendance addressed themselves to the stark warning from Brzezinski. The Democrats in particular, flaccid, complacent and complicit in the war conspiracies of the Bush administration, said nothing about the danger of a provocation spelled out by the witness.

Following the hearing, this reporter asked Brzezinski directly if he was suggesting that the source of a possible provocation might be the US government itself. The former national security adviser was evasive.

The following exchange took place:

Q: Dr. Brzezinski, who do you think would be carrying out this possible provocation?

A: I have no idea. As I said, these things can never be predicted. It can be spontaneous.

Q: Are you suggesting there is a possibility it could originate within the US government itself?

A: I'm saying the whole situation can get out of hand and all sorts of calculations can produce a circumstance that would be very difficult to trace.

www.truthout.org/docs_2006/021207G.shtml

The White House Could Provoke Attacks in the United States

Reporterre

Thursday 08 February 2007

In testimony before the American Senate, Carter's former National Security Advisor considered the hypothesis that the White House could provoke attacks on its own soil to justify an intervention in Iran plausible.

Zbigniew Brzezinski is one of the people most widely respected in geopolitical matters in the United States. Advisor to Jimmy Carter when the latter was President of the United States between 1977 and 1981, he was considered a "hawk among the doves." Since then, he has stayed very attentive to international questions, within the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Notably, he published a widely regarded essay, *Le Grand Echiquier* [The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives] (Hachette, 1997).

Hostile to the war in Iraq, he spoke February 1st before an American Senate committee on the international situation and more specifically on the power struggle with Iran. One passage in his testimony has caught the attention of several observers: the one in which he considers that the White House could provoke a terrorist act in the United States itself to win public opinion over to the idea of an intervention against Iran. Here is the passage:

"A plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran involves Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks; followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure; then by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a "defensive" U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan."

The allusion to a terrorist act in the United States, responsibility for which "would be attributed to the Iranians" is remarkable: an American official at the highest level concedes the idea that the Bush Administration could not only use terrorism to serve its own ends, but even provoke attacks on its own soil in order to justify its aggressive intrigues.

Brzezinski's statements are all the more remarkable in that he himself in his book, *The Grand Chessboard*, deemed that control of central Asia and its oil resources were necessary for the maintenance of American domination.

But he emphasized that it was difficult to obtain a consensus from the American public to support United States' interventions beyond its borders "in the absence of a sudden threat or a feeling by the population that its well-being was at stake." On that occasion, he recalled the example of Pearl Harbor which tipped American opinion in favor of an intervention in the Second World War.

Consequently, it is not "conspiracy theorists" only who are blowing the whistle on such a corruption of American democracy, even if one must not extrapolate too much from the statements of Jimmy

Carter's former advisor. But for several years, many people have, in fact, wondered about the exact unfolding of the events of September 11, 2001 and wonder whether the American administration has not done everything to prevent them [from knowing.] Zbigniew Brzezinski's position provides legitimacy to these questions and undoubtedly constitutes a message addressed to George Bush and his entourage.

<http://cryptogon.com/?p=320>

Zbigniew Brzezinski Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

In *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Zbigniew Brzezinski writes:

In brief, for the United States, Eurasian geostrategy involves the purposeful management of geostrategically dynamic states and the careful handling of geopolitically catalytic states, in keeping with the twin interests of America in the short-term preservation of its unique global power and in the long-run transformation of it into increasingly institutionalized global cooperation. To put it in a terminology that hearkens back to the more brutal age of ancient empires, the three grand imperatives of imperial geostrategy are to prevent collusion and maintain security dependence among the vassals, to keep tributaries pliant and protected, and to keep the barbarians from coming together.

Brzezinski wants to see an American led hegemony of Eurasia. Got that? Good.

What we are seeing here is the balkanization of the elite. This is a clash of the titans, a war of the gods. The most powerful people on the planet don't want the conflict to expand into Iran.

Brzezinski's New World Order involves the heavy use of smoke and mirrors to keep the "vassals" in line. Brute force isn't a smart way to go about it. He's more about buying off elites in target states, selective use of black ops and building broad coalitions with other powerful criminals in order to dominate. Brzezinski's model is heavy on back channel manipulation, secret deals and the realization hegemony is going to happen with the U.S., or without the U.S.

Brzezinski's role as consigliere to the elite has been to get them to realize that, by working together, increasingly impressive crimes are possible, up to and including total control of the planet. On the other hand, to strike out on criminal ventures individually, without the cooperation and coordination with the other partners, risks introducing too much chaos into the system. While this chaos might benefit one crime family, it threatens the rackets of several other crime families.

Continuing the mafia analogy, Dubya, Cheney, Rumsfeld, et. al. are the junkyard dog, thug elements of the crime family that runs the U.S.

Brzezinski, however, serves the class of people outside of view from most of us. He appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, publicly outed the false flag attack plans, and said: "It is also time for the Congress to assert itself." (His speech included the second reference to a false flag operations in Congress in the last few weeks. See Ron Paul's comments.)

Imagine you're a member of the mafia, working some racket that you've always worked, but recently, you've decided to start up some other racket without working through the usual channels. What just happened in the U.S. Senate would be the equivalent of Don Corleone placing a severed horse's head in your bed with you as you slept. (The Iraq Study Group report represented the first warning to this branch of the mafia. It was not heeded.)

Recall what I said about a military coup being the only thing that could stop the war with Iran?

Brzezinski's testimony indicates to me that the expansion of the conflict into Iran might not be allowed to happen. Don't ask me how it will be stopped, but he is the mouthpiece of the people who run this show, not in appearance, but in fact. He didn't say what would happen if Congress doesn't stop the junk yard dogs. Hopefully, Congress is smart enough to parse the meaning of that bloody horse's head on the pillow next to them.

<http://rigint.blogspot.com/2007/02/monolith-monsters.html>

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 07, 2007

The Monolith Monsters

It's always fascinating, and important as well, when conspirators become "conspiracy theorists." Just not always for the same reason.

....

Now let's consider the conspirator cum conspiracy theorist Zbigniew Brzezinski. Last week, while excoriating Bush's Iraq policy before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he warned of "a

plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran." He sees the scenario unfolding with Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks, followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure, then by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the US blamed on Iran, culminating in a "defensive" [his own quotation marks] US military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan. On leaving the hearing, Brzezinski was pointedly asked by reporter Barry Grey whether he was "suggesting that the source of a possible provocation might be the US government itself." He responded that he had "no idea. As I said, these things can never be predicted. It can be spontaneous." Grey followed up, "Are you suggesting there is a possibility it could originate within the US government itself?" To which Brzezinski replied, "I'm saying the whole situation can get out of hand and all sorts of calculations can produce a circumstance that would be very difficult to trace."

This is the same Brzezinski, of course, who rhetorically asked, of his early sponsorship of Islamic radicals as US proxies, "What was more important in the world view of history? The possible creation of an armed, radical Islamic movement, or the fall of the Soviet Empire? A few fired-up Muslims or the liberation of Central Europe and the end of the Cold War?" (And note, Brzezinski's policy of instigation was launched in Afghanistan against its pro-Soviet government in order to goad the USSR into its bloody quagmire.) His book *The Grand Chessboard* (published, I realize with a slight frisson of synchronicity, the same year as Corso's), was cited early in the days following 9/11 as America's road-map of geopolitical ambition in the 21st Century. He knows better than most the reach of the hidden hand. Now, he's dropping broad hints that the US may manufacture a provocation in Iraq, blame it upon Iran and catastrophically broaden the war. So what do we do when they begin to sound like us?

On the one hand we should always be cautious about blithely accepting the word of deep-power embeds, but I also think it helps our understanding along if we admit that their world is neither static nor monolithic. It may appear from a distance that they're all in it together - and at our distance the differences between factions of the global elite may be too nuanced and rarefied to hold much meaning for us - but I believe there's a dynamism among conspirators that often seems lost on their theorists, some of whom like to project a virtual hive-mind upon the powerful. Rather than an undifferentiated block of them, I imagine an inter-penetrating Venn diagram of rival interests, means and analyses, and while Brzezinski is certainly in the thick of it that doesn't mean his opposition to the White House's adventurism is a sham intended only for public consumption. Though his reasons are certainly not the same as mine. (Brzezinski, interested in the efficient projection of American power, can foresee its ruin by the Cheney/Bush model, but he seems to regard it as the accident of bad policy rather than an intentional controlled collapse.)

Billy Shears said...

My two cents: that we are witnessing an internal struggle among the "powers that be", or "hidden hand" or whatever moniker you wish to label the real power.

The "old school" folks made up of Daddy Bush, Brzezinski, James Bakker, etc. who are sitting in the passenger seat versus the "neo-cons" that currently are at the wheel (with Georgie-boy being Cheney's puppet). The rest of us are locked in the trunk.

I think that the whole "Iraq Study Group" was as big a piece of PR and drama (in the sense of being a TV show) as elections are, but there was definately something going on behind the scenes: The old-schoolers trying to reign in the neo-cons and getting publicly shat on in response.

Oarwell said...

... It's possible, that when you ask

"So what do we do when they begin to sound like us?"

the correct response is "be glad." It's conceivable that ZB, representing Team A, has caught wind of another 911 false-flag scheme in the offing, and is trying mightily to scuttle the project. Suggesting at a Senate hearing that the government itself might foment a domestic terror attack is about as close as you can get, if you're ZB, to filming a warning and posting it on YouTube.

Of course, Team A doesn't want the attack on Iran because it will be bad for the oil biz, and Team A has given Team B enough rope with which to hang itself already. The Team A players may be reaping whirlwind oil profits, in part thanks to the Iraq debacle (or, the 'Iraqacle'), but see another cycle of false-flag terror, culminating in the decimation of Iran, as being too risky.

When you're reaping the whirlwind that you nefariously sowed, why risk nuclear armeggedon to increase the marginal rate of return?

It's just a matter of bookkeeping.

For that, and other reasons (looking at oil futures), I don't think there will be an attack on Persia.

The ziocons are barking, yes, but this time around no one is listening, and they know it. Their plan

to nuke Perth Amboy or whatever has been kinda 'outed' by Zbig, so to proceed at this point would be pretty brazen.

This Story is at www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL0702/S00079.htm

Brzezinski Considers The Path To War With Iran

CONSPIRACY THEORY GOES MAINSTREAM ON THE ROAD TO TEHERAN

The Rationale for War

"... a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran..." -- Zbigniew Brzezinski 02 Feb 2007

By Michael Collins

"Scoop" Independent News

Washington, D.C.

Date: Sunday, 11 February 2007 -- Time: 11:07 pm NZT

The National Security Advisor to former President Carter testified before the US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on 1 Feb 2007. Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski delivered a scathing assessment of the core mistakes made by the Bush administration in the Middle East. Just before describing what he termed the mythical historical narrative of the policy, he offered a scenario that the Bush administration might use as a convenient invitation to attack Iran.

War may result from Iraqi failures at governance attributed to Iranian interference followed "...by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a 'defensive' U.S. military action against Iran..." The "act" would lead to a "lonely America" into a conundrum of conflict across Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Further isolation and estrangement from the world would be the end game for the United States.

18 Fateful Words

a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a "defensive" U.S. military action against Iran

Brzezinski doesn't waste any time setting off his own fire works. This phrase appears in the third paragraph (see full text below). He posits a possible justification for attacking Iran; clearly outside the bounds of rationality and built upon a foundation of myths. .

Look at the use of "terrorist act in the U.S." in the context of his prepared statement:

If the United States continues to be bogged down in a protracted bloody involvement in Iraq, the final destination on this downhill track is likely to be a head-on conflict with Iran and with much of the world of Islam at large. A plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran involves Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks; followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure; then by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a "defensive" U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan..

Note: The emphasis by underlining and the use of quotation marks around defensive is found in the original copy and presumed to be that of Dr. Brzezinski.

The remarkable wording is that Iran is "blamed."

"... blamed on Iran..." Does that mean that they did it?

Brzezinski refers to "a 'defensive' U.S. military action" adding emphasis and meaning by the use of quotation marks highlighting defensive. This answers the question about Iran's blame in the scenario. The quotation marks around defensive indicate something other than that. This defines the meaning of "blamed" as somewhat akin to saying Iran would be the patsy, fall guy, or stooge for whoever actually committed the act.

Brzezinski's prepared testimony is a chilling and highly evocative analysis offered by a major player in the U.S. foreign policy establishment. Before serving in the Carter administration, he was the first director of the Trilateral Commission. This isn't speculation by an outsider supporting human rights or a peace activist, its insider information from the highest level of the United States foreign policy establishment.

Shortly after testifying Brzezinski was approached by Barry Grey, reporter for the World Socialist Web. Grey recounts the exchange:

Q: Dr. Brzezinski, who do you think would be carrying out this possible provocation?

A: I have no idea. As I said, these things can never be predicted. It can be spontaneous.

Q: Are you suggesting there is a possibility it could originate within the US government itself?

A: I'm saying the whole situation can get out of hand and all sorts of calculations can produce a circumstance that would be very difficult to trace.

"I have no idea" in response to the "provocation" is certainly not comforting since it implies the blaming of Iran would be arbitrary. Brzezinski's answers above indicate that the terrorist act "can be spontaneous" or "the whole situation can get out of hand and all sorts of calculations" can lead to the act. At one end of the spectrum of anti U.S. terrorist acts, we have something totally random which the administration grabs and runs with as an excuse for war. At the other end, we have out of control "calculations" which at the extreme might be taken to include something like Operation Northwoods given the absence of a denial to Grey's assertion in the second question above.

The plan swings into action...blaming Iran

Gates Says Bombs Tie Iran to Iraq Extremists

Lolita Baldor Associated Press 9 Feb 2007

MUNICH, Germany (Feb. 9) - Serial numbers and other markings on bombs suggest that Iranians are linked to deadly explosives used by Iraqi militants, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said Friday in some of the administration's first public assertions on evidence the military has collected.

Just a week after Brzezinski outlined the modus operandi for the Bush crew, the supposed voice of reason at the Pentagon is selling a story of Iranian subversion. Trying it out on the road in Munich, Germany before the homeland premier, Gates indicated that weapons were found with Iranian serial numbers.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates on his European tour.

"I think there's some serial numbers, there may be some markings on some of the projectile fragments that we found" that point to Iran, he said.

Gates' remarks left unclear how the U.S. knows the serial numbers are traceable to Iran and whether such weapons would have been sent to Iraq by the Iranian government or by private arms dealers.

Compare Gates' tentative assertion to this whopper used to justify Gulf War I: "They took the babies out of the incubators, took the incubators, and left the babies on the cold floor to die" said the Kuwaiti Ambassador's daughter, who, by the way, had never seen anything of the sort. Gates' tentative serial number claim is no way to whip up war fever. Even the AP reporter bluntly questioned his ability to know just what it is about those serial numbers that gives them that tell-tale Iranian look.

So it begins - the rationale for war. The political basis for this scenario explains why the tactics must, of necessity, be so completely inept.

"... 9/11 as the equivalent of the Pearl Harbor..."

After defining the specific dangers from the ill begotten Bush tactics, Brzezinski unveils the mythology that justifies the rush to war.

A mythical historical narrative to justify the case for such a protracted and potentially expanding war is already being articulated. Initially justified by false claims about WMD's in Iraq, the war is now being redefined as the "decisive ideological struggle" of our time, reminiscent of the earlier collisions with Nazism and Stalinism. In that context, Islamist extremism and al Qaeda are presented as the equivalents of the threat posed by Nazi Germany and then Soviet Russia, and 9/11 as the equivalent of the Pearl Harbor attack which precipitated America's involvement in World War II. (Author's emphasis)

This short paragraph is the epitaph for the widely rejected neoconservative policies adopted by the White House. One can only wonder if the last line of the paragraph is a reference to the often quoted line from the Project for a New American Century anticipating the arrival of the brave new

world of United States dominance. That PNAC goal will evolve slowly "...absent some catastrophic and crystallizing event – like a new Pearl Harbor" (p. 51).

Corporate Media Response

Reporter Grey complained vigorously about the lack of corporate media coverage for this testimony. This is one of the minor ironies of this event – a Socialist writer advocating for wide spread coverage of one of the most ardent anti-Communists of our time.

The silence was quickly broken when Barry Schweid of the Associated Press covered the story on the same day of the hearing, 01 Feb:

Brzezinski set out as a plausible scenario for military collision: Iraq fails to meet benchmarks set by the U.S., followed by accusations that Iran is responsible for the failure and then a terrorist act or some provocation blamed on Iran. This scenario, he said, would play out with a defensive U.S. military action against Iran.

They included "blamed" on Iran. The only less than representative element is the absence of quotation marks around defensive to imply something other than real defense. Banner headlines would have helped also.

The AP article appeared on MSNBC's web page, in the Guardian, and other media outlets.

The St. Petersburg Times (Times Wires) story on 2 Feb completes the process AP began and clearly represents the testimony:

While other former U.S. officials and ex-generals have criticized administration policy in committee hearings, none savaged it to the degree Brzezinski did. He set out as a plausible scenario for military collision: Iraq fails to meet benchmarks set by the administration, followed by accusations Iran is responsible for the failure, then a terrorist act or some provocation blamed on Iran, and culminating in so-called defensive U.S. military action against Iran. (Author's emphasis)

This clearly represents the most provocative statement in the testimony. It places the former national security advisor at the head of a pack of distinguished critics. This isn't headline news yet but in just 72 hours we have an honest reading of the implication that a "so-called defensive...action" will arise from a terrorist act of questionable origin.

Now it's time for the White House Press Corp to move in and fully expose the story:

Mr. President, what do you think of a former National Security Advisor Brzezinski's claim that you're cooking up a war with Iran based on a questionable terrorist act?

The author acknowledges the contributions of these early analysts of Dr. Brzezinski's remarks.

END

© Copyright: Please feel free to reproduce and distribute this in any fashion you feel suitable with an attribution of authorship and the publisher, "Scoop" Independent News, plus a link to the article

[return to top of page](#) updated: 2010-12-15